## Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

## Introduction

## **Background**

Missouri began working on the Self-Assessment component of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) in July 2000, and the Self-Assessment was submitted to OSEP in October 2002. The Self-Assessment process involved an analysis of existing data, and resulted in improved data collection methodologies, establishment of baselines, and most importantly, an increased focus on performance and outcomes of students with disabilities. Subsequent to the completion of the Self-Assessment, the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAP) worked through a process which identified two priority areas. These areas were Elementary Achievement and Post-Secondary Outcomes. A third priority, monitoring of city/county jails, was added as a result of a finding of noncompliance in OSEP's response to the Self-Assessment.

The Division worked with Great Lakes Area Regional Resource Center (GLARRC) to design a process to arrive at strategies to address the priority areas. GLARRC facilitated two 2-day meetings with two groups of stakeholders during April 2003. One group dealt with elementary achievement and the second group dealt with post-secondary outcomes. The objectives for the initial meetings were

- To generate, clarify, classify and prioritize causal factors that inhibit a coordinated system and
- To analyze the root causes that inhibit a coordinated system.

The objectives for the second set of meetings were

- To review the system of root causes/barriers and improve outcomes
- To generate clarify, classify and prioritize strategies
- To construct alternative profiles of recommended strategies
- To build consensus on the profile of strategies and
- To map the influence relationship of the consensus profile.

The Improvement Plan, submitted to OSEP in July 2003, is a result of the work of these stakeholders. To date, DESE has not received a letter of response on the Improvement Plan from OSEP. The "Future Activities" section of this APR is largely a repeat of the Improvement Plan since both were to begin with the 2003-04 year. Not enough time has passed since the completion of the Improvement Plan to both implement the plan and assess the impact of the plan.